

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

Q112 – Q131

112. What is the definition of “partial conversion operations”?

Answer: Partial conversion operations is defined as the spectrum of DUF6 conversion operations beginning at the completion of hot functional testing and ending when full conversion facility design production capacity is achieved. It includes the controlled, sequential start-up of each conversion line and performing the operational steps necessary to integrate all conversion lines and balance of plant operations at the full expected conversion facility design capacity.

113. Who will choose what disposal facilities will be used? When?

Answer: The actual disposal facility (ies) for the DUF6 converted product will be a matter of contract administration, and will be made consistent with applicable laws and regulations. For proposal purposes, in accordance with L.24(e)(1)(iv), the Offeror shall assume use of both NTS and Clive, in accordance with the 50/50 split by volume of the converted product. Other disposal facilities, landfills, disposition paths, etc., for all other wastes and materials, shall be chosen by the Offeror and documented and described in the Offeror's Proposal, in accordance with the RFP and applicable laws, regulations and waste acceptance criteria. The approach and activities for management and disposition of conversion products and all other wastes shall be described in the Technical Proposal, in accordance with Section L.23(a).

114. Does DOE have some approved photos of both the Portsmouth and Paducah facilities that it could provide offerors?

Answer: Approved photos will be posted on the DUF6 website as they become available.

115. What is the incumbent's plan for staffing the facility during routine conversion operations?

Answer: For proposal preparation purposes, please refer to the document entitled “Number of UDS Incumbent Employees as of June 30, 2009”, which is available at the DUF6 website:
<http://www.emcbc.doe.gov/duf6/refdocs/Number%20of%20UDS%20Incumbent%20Employees%20as%20of%20June%2030,%202009.pdf>

116. Reference: Amendment 001, item 7, L.21 (e). Amendment 001, L.21 (e) removes Key Personnel Resumes, Letters of Commitment, and Reference Information for Past Performance Worksheets from the list of Volume II page count exceptions. This appears

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

to be inconsistent with RFP L.23(c) and L.23 (d), which the amendment did not revise. These paragraphs state that Resumes, Letters of Commitment and Past Performance Information are excluded from Volume II page limitations. We assume Key Personnel Resumes, Letters of Commitment, and Reference Information for Past Performance Worksheets are excluded from Volume II page limitations. Is our assumption correct?

Answer: Yes. These items are excluded from the page count for Volume II. See the table below for further clarification:

Proposal Requirement	Excluded from Page Count?	RFP Reference
Blank Pages	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)
Cross Reference Matrix	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)
Dividers/Tabs	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)
EVMS	Yes, req. is part of Volume I	A001; L.22(q)
Glossary	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)
Key Personnel Resumes and Commitment Statements	Yes	L.23 (c); third paragraph
Operations Testing and Start-up Plan (OTSP)	No	L.23 (a) ; 3rd paragraph
Reference Information for Past Performance (L-2)	Yes	L.23 (d); 1st paragraph
Representations and Certifications	Yes, req. is part of Volume I	A001; L.22(k)
Small Business Subcontracting Past Performance Information Form (L-11)	Yes	L.23 (d); 1st paragraph
Table of Contents	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)
Title Pages	Yes	A001; L.21 (e)

- 117.** Reference Sect. L.21 (e): Amendment 001, Item 7, removed (by omission) "Resumes" and "Reference Information for Past Performance Worksheets" from those proposal elements not included in the Volume II page count. Despite Amendment 001's increase of the page limit from 125 to 150 pages, it is clear that the amendment's change to make the Resumes and Past Performance section part of the page count will, by itself,

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

significantly reduce the number of available pages for development of other, more heavily weighted, proposal sections.

A conservative page count for resumes and letters of commitment would be: § 4 x 4 = 16 pages which are now required to be counted by omission if the offeror does not propose more than 4 key people. Including resumes in the page count discourages offerors from proposing additional key personnel and thus a potentially stronger management approach. A conservative page count for a Past Performance section would be: § L-2 PPRIFs (2 pages each X three PPRIFs = 6 counted pages) § L-2 ESH&Q forms (4 pages per form, plus 1 page each for narrative reference, X two companies = 10 counted pages) § L-11 Small Business PP forms (1 page each X three reference projects = 3 pages) Total Counted Pages for Past Performance = 19 pages

Therefore, despite the fact that DOE increased the total page limit for Volume II by 25 pages, this increase will be more than consumed by the requirement to now count the resumes (16 pages) and Past Performance (19 pages) sections alone. When other sections now included in the page count are factored into the equation (i.e., EVMS), it becomes clear that a significant page-count deficit now exists. We respectfully request that DOE specifically exclude from page count the following elements: § Attachment L-2 forms (PPRIFs and ESH&Q Past Performance forms) § Attachment L-11 forms § Key Personnel Resumes and Letters of Commitment"

Answer: See response to Question 116.

- 118.** The amendment still raises a question concerning what is included in the page count. On page 9 of 14 of Amendment 001, Section L.21 the revision states: "(e) Page Count Exceptions. Every page of the Volume II – Technical Proposal shall be counted toward the page limitation, including attachments, appendices and annexes except for the Table of Contents, Title Pages, Glossary, Dividers/Tabs, Blank Pages, Representations and Certifications and Cross Reference Matrix." However, the second sentence of the first paragraph of Section L.23(d) (page L-25) of the RFP still states that past performance information will be excluded from the page limitations of Volume II. Is past performance information included or excluded from the page count?

Answer: Past Performance information is excluded from the page count. See response to Question 116.

- 119.** Given the length of Attachment L-2 (Cont.) – the Environmental Safety and Health and Quality (ESH&Q) past performance indicators (4 to 5 pages per write-up), can this Attachment be excluded from the page count?

Answer: Yes, see response to Question 116.

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

- 120.** Attachment L-11 (Small Business Subcontracting Past Performance Information Form), which is approximately 2 pages per large business bidder, was not previously counted against the overall page count. Please clarify whether this form is now considered part of the 150 pages referenced in page 10 of 14 of the Amendment in the first sentence of L.23.

Answer: Attachment L-11 is excluded from the page count; reference L.23 (d) “Past Performance information including L-11 is excluded from the Page count.” See response to Question 116.

- 121.** Amendment 01 replacement text for L.21 includes resumes and Attachments L-2 and L-11 back in the page count, which actually exceeds the additional 25 pages granted in Amendment 01. (Resumes @ 4 pages each, L-2’s at 7 pages each, and L-11’s at 1 page each = 40 pages minimum added back into Volume II.) Is this DOE’s intent, or can these items be excluded from page count as originally stated in the RFP?

Answer: See response to Question 116.

- 122.** Reference: Amendment 001, item 7, L.21(e). The revised language for L.21(e) excludes from Volume II page count ...Representations and Certifications, (which are to be submitted with Volume I entitled “Offer and Other Documents”)...

(a) We assume this Volume II page count reference to Representations and Certifications refers only to Section K.5, Notice of Earned Value Management System. Is our assumption correct?

Answer: No. There are other “Representations and Certifications”(see Section L.22(k)) items that must be included with Volume I. Suggest offerors review Section K closely for those other submission.

(b) It is unclear if DOE’s intent is to include the EVMS Plan required by Section K.5 only in Volume I, or if the EVMS Plan should be placed in Volume I and in Volume II, where it is excluded from the Volume II page count. We assume the EVMS Plan, required by Section K.5, Earned Value Management System, appears only in Volume I. Is our assumption correct?

Answer: Yes.

- 123.** Reference: Amendment 001, item 7, L.23(b) BUSINESS MANAGEMENT; sixth paragraph. L.23(b) BUSINESS MANAGEMENT; sixth paragraph has been revised in Amendment 001 to state ...offeror shall provide information for three (3) contracts... This requirement appears to be inconsistent with L.23(d) PAST PERFORMANCE, paragraphs one and two. Paragraph one states...the same three contracts identified for relevant experience... Paragraph two states...If the offeror is a new business entity, provide the

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

information required above for each of its teaming partners and/or major subcontractors. Please clarify whether we are to provide information in relevant experience for 1) three contracts or 2) three contracts for each teaming partner and/or major subcontractors.

Answer: Offerors shall submit for Relevant Experience three (3) contracts for each offeror, teaming or joint venture partners and major subcontractors (\$10 million or more). The same three (3) contracts for each offeror, teaming or joint venture partners and major subcontractors (\$10 million or more) will be used to evaluate Past Performance.

- 124.** L.23(b) (page 12 of 14) of Amendment 01 states that the offeror shall provide three (3) contracts completed in the last 5 years. Please confirm that DOE wants a total of three contracts from each bidding team, including “the offeror, teaming or joint venture partners and major subcontractors” and not three contracts each from “the offeror, teaming or joint venture partners or major subcontractors proposed to perform subcontracts of \$10 million or more.”

Answer: See response to Question 123.

- 125.** Section L.24(e)(1)(ii) (Page 12 of 14 of Amendment 01) now states that the “Cost and Fee Proposal shall include a cost correlated with Section C and consistent with the offeror’s Technical Proposal and Work Breakdown Structure (WBS).” Do we still have the flexibility to add a WBS element where appropriate to correlate with our technical approach?

Answer: Yes. Offerors shall crosswalk additional WBS elements to the applicable Statement of Work section

- 126.** In reference to Q&A question #10; how many HF transport cars will be made available?

Answer: The buyer will be responsible for providing sufficient transportation equipment to transport the product. Specific quantities cannot be determined at this time.

- 127.** In reference to Q&A question #12, how many gondola cars will be made available?

Answer: The gondola cars are included in the government furnished property list.

- 128.** In Q&A 50, DOE states Volume III financial statements are subject to the consecutive page numbering requirement. Our financial statements are consecutively numbered within each 10-K annual report. For ease of DOE’s review, we plan to place all financial statements in the same section within Volume III without altering the consecutive page

DUF6 RFP Questions & Answers

numbering that is on record with the SEC and found in the public domain. Is this presentation acceptable to DOE?

Answer: Yes

- 129.** L.21 "DOE's answer to Question 59 implies that the addition of 25 allowable pages was to address the need for a detailed (level 6-7) schedule in the OTSP. However, with the elimination of resumes and past performance as uncounted pages [they are now required to be counted by process of elimination in Amendment 1 to L.21(e)], the new 25 pages are more than offset by the need to count resumes, past performance, and ES&H data. This still leaves us with a need for additional pages for the expanded schedule in the OTSP."

Answer: See response to Question 116.

- 130.** In response to Question 77, DOE indicates that offerors can propose utilities in various ways. However, in answers to Questions 36, 37, 38, and 39, which all relate to utilities, DOE refers Offerors to the answer to Question 32. This answer refers in turn to Attachment J-5, which identifies responsibilities for the services to be provided. Please confirm that offerors can only propose utilities in the same manner as identified in Attachment J-5.

Answer: Yes, offerors can only propose utilities as described in Section J, Attachment J-5.*

***Note:** This response supersedes our previous response to Question 77.

- 131.** Question 88 asks the following question: "Can we assume, if DOE does not exercise the hot functional testing option in the RFP that, upon assumption of the work, partial operations and ramp up to design capacity will have been achieved?" DOE has answered this question "Yes." This response indicates that all seven lines would be fully operational. By contrast, the Incumbent's start-up plan implies that Hot Functional Testing only includes initial startup and ramp-up to design capacity of the first line. Partial operations would then include startup of the remaining lines and ramp up to bring all of the lines to design capacity. Please clarify what the "base case" is if the option is not exercised – will the offeror or the incumbent be performing partial operations which includes bringing all lines up to design capacity? Second, if hot functional testing, partial operations, and ramp-up to design capacity is not awarded to the incoming contractor, will be RA be required and, if so, will it be a DOE RA or an Offeror RA?

Answer: If DOE does not exercise the Hot Functional Testing option in the RFP, the contractor will complete the SOW as listed in C.3.1.3.5 excluding the work listed in paragraphs a) thru r) of Section C.3.1.3.5